EUROPEAN MULTIDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF MODERN SCIENCE
https://emjms.academicjournal.io/index.php/ Volume:6

Modern Foundations of the State Institute

Kurbanov Eldar Ermamatovich
Gulistan State University, Department of "History" senior teacher

Bozorova Madina Turaboy qizi
Gulistan State University, student

Abstract: In the following article, the world tries to reveal the mutual harmony of democracy with society, the direct impact of democratization on the activity of citizens, modern theory of state institutions and democratization in the late XX century and beginning of XXI century. Ensuring the logical duration and stability of the democratization of society is also dependent on how accurately these tasks are performed due to some acquired conditions and characteristics of society. It is worth noting that in the system of transition to democracy, each stage has its own unique important role, which is manifested more closely at the present time as the basis for timely notice of them, taking measures to resolve the issues, resolving the continuity of the processes of democratization of society.

Keywords: state institutions, the consequences of democratization in the XXI century, modern theory, transition stages, ideas of democracy, "state capacity", state, law, democracy, conceptual ideas.

Introduction

In research on democracy carried out on a global scale, specific and tolerant views began to be expressed at the beginning of the XXI century, and the scope of research on them is also increasing. It is also the potential of the state and the conceptual ideas associated with the importance of such an indicator of quality for democracy and its development.

Analysis of the literature on the topic (Literature overview). Russian scientists such as A. Melville, D. Stukal and M. Mironyuk noted that the state, statehood and state potential have "state capacity" problems on one hand – the problem of democracy and democratization, on the other hand, has risen to the forefront in comparative political research today" [1, p. 43].

From the research, it was found that the research on the potential of the state, first of all its political regime and democratic aspects, was carried out by western scientists such as Ch. Tilli (2010), V. Van Krevald (2013), Minsk (2014), Banholyen (2017), Memoli (2015).

Among Russian Federation scientists such as M. Mironyuk, V. Ivanov (2015), A. Melville (2016), D. Stukal (2016), Efimov (2016) also carried out serious research in this regard [2, p.10].

So in this regard, there was created much larger scientific base. But at the same time, within the framework of the scientific research under consideration, it is important and relevant to make a comparative analysis of them and develop appropriate conclusions and recommendations. Because, **firstly**, the practice of linking the state's potential with the economic sphere was objectively leadership.

Secondly, today there has not been a single solution on the issue of the potentiality of the state, it is necessary to carry out a large-scale scientific research on the scientific

understanding of how important it is for democracy, proceeding from the practice of the state, which is taken separately.

A politician professor U. Idirov said in his note brought forward that “the existence of the potentiality of the state to promote new ideas on the democratization of society, to priventively accept and implement political decisions based on the interests of national ascension is the most leading condition and basis of democratic development” [3, p.40].

Without any exaggeration, we can say that this approach has become a phenomenon of the XXI century.

One of the largest representatives of modern political philosophy, A. Melville and a Russian politician scientist M. Mironyuk’s researches on the example of some states “brought the following examples concerning the state potentiality index. According to them, the status of states with a stable high potentiality at a rate of 10 points (according to the ranking of 1995-2005-2015 years) is already mentioned.

As following: Sweden (10.0-10.0-8,9), Switzerland (9,3-9.3-8,5), New Zealand (9,4-9,2-8,7), Japan (9.2-9.2-9.2), Australia (9,4-8,4-9,4), Norway (8,9-9,2-9,2), Denmark (8,3-8,3-8,3), Austria (8,2-8,2-7,1), Finland (7,9-7,9-7,9), United Kingdom (7,3-8,0-7,3) [4, p.43].

While thinking about the link between the potential of the state and democracy, the analysis shows that with the possibility of governance of the state, the situation of a high level of “civil society” of members of a high level of “civil capacity” of members of society must also be necessarily implied.

Russian scientist A.Volyuvi believes that, “the concept of state governance means the existence of the state institute's ability to pay extremely rapid attention to the demands coming from society as well as from external processes, the increase in communications, relationship and cooperation between the state and society, as well as formation of common values for its development between citizens and state governance bodies” [5, p.44].

Analysis and Results (Analysis and results). Today, as representatives of “neoliberalism” claim that, a strong state is necessary for the restoration of an unconventional society. Only such a state is able to change the values of the sosium and achieve its members the adoption of new norms of behavior, while the strong state factor for classical liberalism was alien” [6, p.151].

When thinking about the state and its potential, that is, about the state of being able to support, protect democracy, it is necessary to remember in the first place that F. Fukuyama who is one of the most moderate political scientists of the present time pointed out that democracy was “three leading institutions that were first necessary for development and most importantly must be practiced in mutual cooperation. These are: state, law and democracy. [7, p.27].

The necessity to highlight such questions in order to be satisfied in advance, the approach to democracy as a method of state administration means that it is equal to not being able to see the main aspects of it. Because in fact, both democracy and the state are an incredibly multi-layered phenomenon. The state determines the methods of organizing life of society, the rules of relations in it, the form of political order. Democracy, on the other hand, with the ideas of its values, becomes a hindrance to the humanization of the ideas of statehood and strengthening the effectiveness and legitimacy of state administration, ensuring strong political and social stability of society.

This approach implies a broad coverage and generalized attitude towards the phenomenon of democracy.

So, the state is the most important phenomenon as a decisive factor in regards with the fate of democracy as a sum of multidimensional institutions.

Prominent western scientists engaged in the theory of democracy such as such as H. Lins and A. Stepan wrote: “There can be no modern democracy without the influence of the state” [8, p.39].

In this regard, it would be worthwhile to express one more opinion. That is, it is no secret that democracy, according to its methods of function, dictates the participation of many subjects in political processes. US political scientist R.Dal called such a case with the term “polyarchia”.

It is worth noting that “in the following years, even in the conditions of a pandemic in 2020 year, the national state factor was able to demonstrate its ultimate viability. Therefore, efforts to repeatedly study the state and its nature are gaining momentum” [9, p.149].

Certainly, when the state factor is approached from the point of view of the development of democracy, the most important methodological rule is that “the need to pay attention to the state, the statehood and the state potential concepts differ from each other is emphasized by many specialist scientists. Because the concept of statehood in this place means the status of the state, that is, its internal and external sovereignty. The concept of state capacity refers to the evolution of its coverage of quality indicators in the process of state construction. These conclusions, found their expression especially in the works of russian scientists M. Ilin, E. Meleshkina [10, p.9-10].

The following approach, in its turn, serves as an important methodological tool for high-precision understanding of the institutional and conceptual foundations of the interconnection between the state potential and democracy, making scientific conclusions on the most pressing needs of the present-day democratic development.

This means that the level of democratization in the character and functioning of state institutions represents the nature of the state’s potential serving democracy.

Western scientists such as F. Fukuyama, E. Mansfield, J. Snyder, Y. Moller and S. Snaaning promoted conclusions of russian scientists A. Melville, D. Stukal, M. Mironyuk’ ideas that “the state is the most primordial motivator of the origin and development of democracy (Fukuyama 2007; Mansfield, Snyder, 2007; Moller, Snaaning, 2011).

The main idea in them is that democratization leads to political and social chaos and economic decline without quality state institutions” [11, p.86].

The reason is that the political ideas of democracy occupy a deep place in society in the image of state institutions operating in anticipation of the needs of the democracy.

In order to clarify our thoughts, which are expressed in this place, it is necessary to say that the concept of “state potential”, which is being developed by us within the framework of this study, is expressed by russian scientists as “state solvency (gosudarstvennaya sostoyatelnost)”, and by english modern scientists in the category “state capacity”. In the research of western and russian scientists in the process of analysis, these concepts are deeply grounded in all aspects.

At the same time, the results of the study of this issue suggest that the conclusions in this regard have not yet been able to reach its final level. Therefore, scientific discussions on this topic is being continued.

Because, with the increase in the state potential, the processes of development of democracy, the possibility of the phenomenon of democracy, due to the fact that it is unprecedented in size, can continue infinitely from the point of view of the speech of the seizure of new stages.

The basis of this hypothesis is explained by the fact that in some countries of the world today the same effective models of democracy are formed.

“The theoretical and empirical data collected so far, relying on evidence, should be said with confidence once again, democratization will be effective in a space where the state’s potential is relatively high” [12, p.57].

Because, “under such conditions, the state can effectively manage the flow of aspirations, goals, motivations in civil activities and its role as a system of managing the circumstances of changes in them” [13, p.93].

That is, an important conclusion arising from this is that any electoral activity does not serve the interests of democracy either. Of course, it will be necessary to distinguish between the activity, participation of citizens, arising from the fundamental interests of democracy and in an acceptable standard, with non logical fuss for democracy.

Because democracy requires political activity of citizens who are acceptable to it. And the fact that too much chaos leads not to democracy, but on the contrary to the result that is opposite to it, is known to us from experiments. That is, the sosial capital of democracy, represented by members of society, should have a feature that serves as a source of democracy in terms of its quality indicators, political purposes.

Conclusion. The strong expression of the population towards the democracy causes the state to have a social resource that is desperately needed for it to exceed its potential for democracy. At the same time, the need to draw attention to the social sphere also became an important universal sign of democracy. So, it is necessary that the overgrowth of mutually beneficial cooperation between the state and democracy be evaluated as the most modern phenomenon that determines the prospect of democracy. This trend is universal and at the same time has the essence inherent in every country.

References

1. Иванов В. Концепция государственной состоятельности: сравнителнқе межстрановия рейтинги против госубарственной легитимности // Вестник РУДН, Серия междунароные отношения, 2015. №3.
2. Ахременко А., Горельский И., Мельвил А. Как и зачем состоятельность разных стран мира? // Полис, 2019. №2.
3. Идиров У.Ю. Замонавий демократик тараққиётида ёшлар инновацион фаолиятининг роли. Т.: “BAYOZ”, 2019.
4. Мельвиль А. Миронюк М. «Политический атлас современности» Revisited // Полис, 2020. №6. .
5. Волкова А. Управляемость государство и гражданская сосотоятельность//Исторические, филосовфские, политические и юридические науки, культурология и исскуствоведение. Вопросқ теории и практики. Тамбов: “Грамота”, 2014. №4.
6. Лункин Р., Филатов С. Борьба “за” и “против” идентисности во внутри-политических процессах// Мировая экономика и международные отношения, 2019. №4.

7. Лебедева М. Харкевич М. Зиновьева Е., Коносова Е. Архаизация государства: роль современных информационных технологий//Полис, 2016. №6.
8. Лебедева М. Современные мегатренды мировой политики// Мировая экономика и международные отношения, 2019. №9.
9. Лапкин В. Государство во время пах и пространствах: многообразие и изменчивость//Полис, 2020. №6.
10. Мелешкина Е. Исследования государственной состоятельности: какие уроки мы можем извлечь? // Политическая наука, 2011. №2.
11. Мельвиль А. Миронюк М. Стукал Д. Государственная состоятельность, демократия и демократизация (напримере посткоммунистических стран)//Политическая наука, 2012. №4.
12. Мельвиль А. Ефимов Д. «Демократический левиафан»? Режимные изменения и государственная состоятельность-проблема взаимосвязи// Политическая наука, 2016. №4.
13. Соловьев. В. Государство как производитель политики.//Полис, 2016. №2.